

Comment on "the controlled charge ordering and evidence of the metallic state in $\text{Pr}_{0.65}\text{Ca}_{0.35}\text{MnO}_3$ films"

W. Prellier* and B. Raveau

Laboratoire CRISMAT, CNRS UMR 6508, Bd du

Maréchal Juin, 14050 Caen Cedex, FRANCE.

(February 1, 2008)

Abstract

In a recent paper (2000 *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **12** L133) Lee *et al.* have studied the transport properties of $\text{Pr}_{0.65}\text{Ca}_{0.35}\text{MnO}_3$ thin films. They claimed that they are able to controlled the charge-ordered (CO) state by the lattice strains. We propose herein another alternative since another indexation of the orientation of the film can be found leading to almost no distortion of the cell, as compared to the bulk compound.

*prellier@ismra.fr

In a recent paper dealing with the study of $\text{Pr}_{0.65}\text{Ca}_{0.35}\text{MnO}_3$ thin films, Lee *et al.*¹ have shown that the "appearance of the charge-ordered (CO) state at 205 K can be controlled via the lattice strains accumulated during the film growth"

Even if few papers have been published up to now on the particular compounds showing the charge ordering state²⁻⁵, the manganite thin films have been extensively studied in the past years due to their properties of colossal magnetoresistance, a huge decrease in resistance when applying a magnetic field⁶⁻⁹. These authors present results of their X-Rays and resistivity measurements of $\text{Pr}_{0.65}\text{Ca}_{0.35}\text{MnO}_3$ thin films grown by the pulsed laser deposition.. They obtain X-Rays diffraction (XRD) patterns highly resolved peaks. Considering that these peaks correspond to the $00l$ reflections (002 and 004 respectively) of the $\text{Pr}_{1-x}\text{Ca}_x\text{MnO}_3$ type structure, they demonstrate that the as-grown thin film of the manganite is tetragonal with $a = b = 5.432\text{\AA}$ and $c = 7.74\text{\AA}$, i.e. fundamentally different from the bulk material with the same composition $\text{Pr}_{0.65}\text{Ca}_{0.35}\text{MnO}_3$ which is orthorhombic with $a = 5.42\text{\AA}$, $b = 5.46\text{\AA}$ and $c = 7.67\text{\AA}$ ¹⁰. Unfortunately, for the determination of the structure, they also use weak reflections of the perovskite (103, 113 and 312) which appear on they XRD pattern, but which belong to a secondary phase with a different orientation and possibly with a different composition (note, that the cationic composition of the film has not been checked and that a small change in composition can drastically modify the parameters of the cell and therefore the properties). Nevertheless, the authors conclude that lattice strains are at the origin of the wired behavior of this thin film which exhibits, according to them, a metallic like;e behavior with a incredibly high resistivity of $10^5 \Omega.cm$ below 120K ! After, a brief summary on the charge-ordering, we will show that another conclusion can be proposed leading to no distortion of the cell as compared to the bulk material.

Hole-doped manganites, with the general formula $\text{RE}_{1-x}\text{A}_x\text{MnO}_3$ (RE=rare earth, A=alkaline earth) exhibit a rich phase diagram as a function of the doping concentration x . As the average size of the cations at the lanthanide site is reduced, the tilt of the MnO_6 octahedra is induced which favors the localization and ordering of the $\text{Mn}^{3+}/\text{Mn}^{4+}$ cations¹¹.

Moreover, below a certain temperature (T_{CO}), the metallic state becomes unstable and the material goes to an insulating state. Such a charge-ordering transition is associated with antiferromagnetic, insulating properties and large lattice distortions. Another amazing feature is that the application of a magnetic field results in the melting of the CO state (i.e. the material becomes ferromagnetic metallic). This phenomenon has been observed in $\text{Pr}_{1-x}\text{Ca}_x\text{MnO}_3$ (with $0.35 < x < 0.65$)¹². Thus, the composition $\text{Pr}_{0.65}\text{Ca}_{0.35}\text{MnO}_3$ studied in the described paper shows in bulk, a CO state at low temperature.

We propose another alternative concerning the crystallographic nature of this $\text{Pr}_{0.65}\text{Ca}_{0.35}\text{MnO}_3$ thin film. It has been shown previously^{13,14}, using electron diffraction, that many manganite thin films with a $Pbnm$ space group (as $\text{Pr}_{0.65}\text{Ca}_{0.35}\text{MnO}_3$), are often $[110]$ -oriented when grown on LaAlO_3 (as used by Lee *et al.*). Thus, it can instead be proposed that these peaks on the XRD pattern do not correspond to the $00l$ reflections but to the $hk0$ reflections (i.e. 110 and 220 respectively). As a consequence, the d_{220} and d_{004} observed values and deduced from the datas obtained by the authors ($d_{220}^{obs} \cong 1.93\text{\AA}$ and $d_{004}^{obs} \cong 1.92\text{\AA}$ for the as-grown and $d_{220}^{obs} \cong 1.92\text{\AA}$ $d_{004}^{obs} \cong 1.96\text{\AA}$ for the annealed film) are perfectly compatible with those calculated from the parameters of the cell of the corresponding bulk compound ($d_{220}^{cal} \cong d_{004}^{cal} \cong 1.92\text{\AA}$ ¹⁰). In others words the XRD pattern of the $\text{Pr}_{0.65}\text{Ca}_{0.35}\text{MnO}_3$ thin film suggests that the film is identical to the bulk, and this does not bring any proof about the accumulation of the lattice strains during the film growth, contrary to the statement of the authors.

In conclusion, the assumption upon the orientation of the film of $\text{Pr}_{0.65}\text{Ca}_{0.35}\text{MnO}_3$ made by these authors is purely speculative. This demonstrates that the thin films must be correctly characterized from the crystal structure viewpoint before going to physical measurements, using electron diffraction to reconstruct the reciprocal space. For this reason, all the physics which is developed in this paper might be uncorrected.

REFERENCES

- ¹ Y.P. Lee, V.G. Prokhorov, J.Y. Rhee, K.W. Kim, G.G. Kaminsky and V.S. Flis, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* 2000 **12** L133.
- ² V. Ponnambalam, S. Parashar, A.R. Raju and C.N.R. Rao, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* 1999 **74** 206.
- ³ W. Prellier, A. Biswas, M. Rajeswari, T. Venkatesan and R.L. Greene, *App. Phys. Lett.* 1999 **75** 397.
- ⁴ W. Prellier, A.M. Haghiri-Gosnet, B. Mercey, Ph. Lecoeur, M. Hervieu and B. Raveau, *App. Phys Lett.* 2000 **77** 1023.
- ⁵ P. Wagner, I. Gordon, A. Vantomme, D. Dierickx, M.J. Van Bael, V.V. Moshchalkov and Y. Bruynseraede, *Europhys. Lett.* 1998 **41** 49.
- ⁶ R. Von Helmolt, J. Wecker, R. Holzapfel, L. Schultz, K. Samwer, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 1993 **71** 2331.
- ⁷ M. M. McCormack, S. Jin, T. Tiefel, R.M. Fleming, J.M. Philips, R. Ramesh, *App. Phys. Lett.* 1994 **64**, 3045.
- ⁸ T. Venkatesan, M. Rajeswari, Z-W. Dong, S.B. Ogale and R. Ramesh, *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. London* 1998 **356** 1661.
- ⁹ S. Jin, T.H. Tiefel, M. McCormack, R.A. Fastnacht, R. Ramesh and L.H. Chen, *Science* 1996 **75** 333.
- ¹⁰ Z. Jirak, S. Krupicka, Z. Simsa, M. Doulka and S. Vratislma, *J. Magn. Magn. Mat.* 1985 **53** 153.
- ¹¹ C.N.R. Rao, A. Arulraj, A.K. Cheetham and B. Raveau, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter.* 2000 **12** R83.

- ¹² Y. Tomioka, A. Asamitsu, H. Kuwahara, Y. Moritomo and Y. Tokura, *Phys. Rev. B* 1996 **53** R1689.
- ¹³ B. Mercey, J. Wolfman, W. Prellier, M. Hervieu, Ch. Simon and B. Raveau, *Chem. Mat.* 2000 **12** 2858, B. Mercey, Ph. Lecoeur, M. Hervieu, J. Wolfman, Ch. Simon, H. Murray and B. Raveau, *ibid.* 1997 **9** 1177.
- ¹⁴ A.M. Haghiri-Gosnet, M. Hervieu, Ch. Simon, B. Mercey and B. Raveau, *J. App. Phys.* 2000 **88** 3545.